

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
CHARLESTON DIVISION

Maurice Dunbar,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	C.A. No. 2:10-1775-HMH-BHH
)	
vs.)	OPINION & ORDER
)	
James Metts, Living Person in charge)	
of LCDC; City Cou[n]sel or Person)	
who oversee the courts, living person)	
in charge,)	
)	
Defendants.)	

This matter is before the court with the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Bruce Howe Hendricks, made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) and Local Civil Rule 73.02 of the District of South Carolina.¹ Maurice Dunbar (“Dunbar”), a pretrial detainee proceeding pro se, brought an action under 42 U.S.C. § 1983, alleging various violations to his civil rights. In her Report and Recommendation, Magistrate Judge Hendricks recommends dismissing this matter without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

Dunbar filed objections to the Report and Recommendation. Failure to file specific objections constitutes a waiver of a party’s right to further judicial review, including appellate

¹ The recommendation has no presumptive weight, and the responsibility for making a final determination remains with the United States District Court. See Mathews v. Weber, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The court is charged with making a de novo determination of those portions of the Report and Recommendation to which specific objection is made. The court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation made by the magistrate judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

review, if the recommendation is accepted by the district judge. See United States v. Schronce, 727 F.2d 91, 94 & n.4 (4th Cir. 1984). In the absence of specific objections to the Report and Recommendation of the magistrate judge, this court is not required to give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. See Camby v. Davis, 718 F.2d 198, 199 (4th Cir. 1983).

Upon review, the court finds that Dunbar's objections are non-specific, unrelated to the dispositive portions of the magistrate judge's Report and Recommendation, or merely restate his claims. Further, the court has conducted a de novo review and concludes that the magistrate judge has properly recited the facts and applied the law. Therefore, after a thorough review of the magistrate judge's Report and the record in this case, the court adopts Magistrate Judge Hendricks' Report and Recommendation.

Therefore, it is

ORDERED that this matter is dismissed without prejudice and without issuance and service of process.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

s/Henry M. Herlong, Jr.
Senior United States District Judge

Greenville, South Carolina
April 19, 2011

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

Plaintiff is hereby notified that he has the right to appeal this order within thirty (30) days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.